

United States Patent and Trademark Office



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/070,867	03/12/2002	Maria Giuseppina Martini	IT 010006	2617
7590 01/20/2004			EXAMINER	
Philips Electronics North America Corporation			WAMSLEY, PATRICK G	
Corporate Patent Counsel 580 White Plains Road Tarrytown, NY 10591			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2819	
			DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/070 <u>,</u> 867	MARTINI ET AL.				
Advicery Medicin	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Patrick G Wamsley	2819				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 06 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applicable in timely filed amendment whit all (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in				
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):	·				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	•					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-13.		*				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:	•	-				
-						

..

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Application No.

Continuation of 5.

The examiner maintains the enablement rejection. The examiner is not convinced by applicant's arguments because they do not address the critical problem with the claims. Instead of a "single" length field, the disclosed data structure seems to have a plurality of fields. See Figure 6, for example, a drawing that displays three length fields [If]. Also see lines 15-16 of page 2. Until this issue is resolved, the claims cannot be properly evaluated against the prior art of record.

Other problems:

Page 9, line 5: "start codes substitution" Page 10, line 7: "can fast and easily be"

Claim 11, line 7: "field information" instead of -- information field --